

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 PRISCELLA R. SAINTAL,

Case No. 2:11-cv-00445-MMD-PAL

8 Plaintiff,

9 ORDER

10 SHERYL FOSTER, et al.,

(Plf.'s Motion to Clarify for Appeal of
11 Defendants. Orders – dkt. no. 84)

12 Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Clarify for Appeal of Orders. (Dkt. no. 84.)
13 Plaintiff contends that the Court erroneously construed her previous motion, which she
14 titled as "Plaintiff's Notice of Motion Objecting to Courts Ruling and/or Order" (dkt. no.
15 82) ("Objection") as a request for reconsideration. Plaintiff argues she was not seeking
16 reconsideration. However, as the Court observed in addressing her Objection, Plaintiff
17 failed to identify the procedural rule upon which she seeks relief but because Plaintiff
18 argued that the Court committed clear error, her Objection was construed as a request
19 for reconsideration (dkt. no. 83). By arguing that the Court made clear error, Plaintiff was
20 essentially asking the Court to reconsider its earlier ruling. Plaintiff now argues that she
21 was objecting pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 46 to preserve her rights to appeal. To the
22 extent Plaintiff is concerned about preserving her appellate rights, Plaintiff retains her
23 rights to appeal the Court's decisions in this case without having to file a formal written
24 objection to the Court's rulings. It is therefore ordered that Plaintiff's Motion to Clarify is
25 denied.

26 DATED THIS 4th day of March 2014.

27
28 
MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE